

**DUBLIN CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION
TUESDAY, AUGUST 29, 2022
COUNCIL CHAMBER
6:00 PM**

Minutes

Mayor Fox called the August 29, 2022 work session to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present were: Ms. Amorose Groomes, Vice Mayor De Rosa, Mayor Fox, Mr. Keeler, Ms. Kramb, Mr. Reiner, and Ms. Alutto.

Staff present were: Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Rogers, Mr. McCollough, Ms. Weisenauer, Ms. Rauch, Ms. O'Callaghan, Chief Paez, Ms. Blake, Ms. Goliver, Mr. Dearth, Ms. Holt, Ms. Readler, Ms. Weisenauer, Mr. Farrar.

Also present: Greg Dale, McBride Dale Clarion

Mr. Reiner led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Board and Commission Liaison

Vice Mayor De Rosa introduced the topic of the board and commission liaison role and provided a brief history. In February, City Council began discussing how to document the role of liaison and decided to add it to their Rules of Order. Council referred the item to the Administrative (Admin) Committee where it was discussed, brought back to Council, was referred back to Admin, and the Admin Committee has suggested language that was provided to Council. When this topic was originally introduced, there were a set of questions before Council to be answered when drafting this document. She suggested going through the questions to ensure they have been answered.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked Ms. Amorose Groomes for an update on her experience so far as a Council Liaison to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she has attended 5 or 6 agenda meetings. Staff, Legal, and PZC leadership attends the agenda meetings. The Planning Director goes over each case on the agenda covering push points and backstories as well as how communication has gone. PZC leadership will ask any questions they may have and they will then ask for sticking points from Council. Potential Council issues typically have to do with site layout. Ms. Amorose Groomes shared that she will often offer items that might be important to Council. She does reiterate that Dublin always tries to make adjacent developments as good as or better than what is next to them. Legal is always in the room for agenda meetings. She does not speak to PZC members outside of that room. There are very bright lines for that communication.

Mr. Keeler asked if Ms. Amorose Groomes feels that this fulfills the purpose. Ms. Amorose Groomes responded affirmatively. Sometimes the Commission Members agree with her and you will see that reflected in meeting minutes but sometimes they do not. She is grateful they feel comfortable to disagree and glad they feel free to go their own way. If Dublin is going to have a PZC, Council needs to be prepared to have outcomes we do not like. That is democracy.

Vice Mayor De Rosa referenced the first question - "What is Council's purpose/goal in establishing the liaison role?" The document as drafted states that the purpose is to facilitate two-way communication.

Mayor Fox stated that she thinks it is important that the liaison has the opportunity at an agenda meeting to have those conversations. She feels the purpose of a liaison might be broader. The liaison has the opportunity to do a variety of things in addition to attending the agenda meeting. She sees the liaison as a circular communicator between the Commission, Council, and staff to make sure the Commission members have the education and materials they need to do their job. She suggested that the liaison could make sure the members receive the City Manager's memo and possibly host workshop meetings between board and commission and Council. She feels the liaison should be allowed to talk outside meetings to check in and to let them know we are there to help. Commission members have a big job that is complex. Vice Mayor De Rosa asked if those items are covered in Section C within the drafted rules. Ms. Kramb stated that in her opinion, all of that is covered in C. What is not specifically stated is when those communications occur. The agenda meeting is a great time. It is regular and there is staff and legal in attendance. If there are questions, they can be asked there. Mayor Fox stated that the agenda meetings are only attended by the two PZC members and there may be other commission members that have questions. Last year, the Mayor and Vice Mayor interviewed board and commission members and there was value in that. More communication cannot be harmful. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that we put joint meetings on the calendar for a reason for all of Council and she thinks that those meetings are the best place for that communication. Communication is difficult when there is a large volume of conversation with 7 members. She would put the responsibility for assistance and training on staff. If they see voids in skills, staff should bring that forward and suggest training. The liaison's role is to communicate Council's positions on things; for example, it is important to continue to lean on materials, site layout, parking issues, etc. It can become a game of telephone if there are too many conversations. We should not be discussing applications specifically. She would lean on staff to outline training and suggest we have at least one meeting per year collectively. Mayor Fox asked about the interviews that were held last year. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she would assume those interviews would happen. There was a summary written up and shared from that. They were not one-on-one meetings. Mayor Fox asked about onboarding and if that is an opportunity to have a conversation or share Council's position. Ms. Rauch explained that onboarding is done with legal and staff and covers a lot of information. There can be a follow

up conversation. Mr. Reiner stated that a lot of this has to do with clarity. Some of the consensus of Council would be helpful to board and commission members.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked for additional thoughts, changes or additions. Mr. Keeler agreed with the communication part of the document. It is very important that liaison reinforce Council goals and vision with regard to specific cases on the docket and joint meetings are the opportunity to reconfirm vision and policy. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that some flexibility in the language of the document is important. She thinks section "B" binds Council's hands. She suggested updating wording to state that liaisons may or may not be members of assigned boards/commission. Sometimes a Council member serving as a board or commission member was helpful and sometimes not. Preserving that ability might be appropriate. Ms. Kramb stated that her problem is with the voting capacity. A Council member has more clout being there. She has served on boards with a Council member and without and she is okay leaving it written so that a Council member would not have voting authority. Vice Mayor De Rosa stated the language in the rules does not technically preclude Council from placing a member on PZC. Ms. Readler stated that there could be a Council member representative on a board/commission. That type of position could be created by legislation. These are just the rules and are meant to be operational.

Ms. Alutto stated that she is comfortable with the language as it is.

Ms. Kramb stated that Council goals and vision could be inserted into Section E to address Keeler's concern.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she feels it is important to add planning staff and legal under Section F to clarify that these are not one on one. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the items reviewed by PZC are critical and care needs to be taken as this is a powerful entity. She agrees with adding staff and legal to Section F. She referenced back to Section B and stated that she does not want to have this document be in conflict with the Charter. Ms. Readler clarified that a liaison is not the same as a board/commission member that Council could appoint.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked if the liaison should be expanded beyond PZC. Do we wish to have Council liaisons to more than one board or commission. The Admin Committee did determine that there are two types of boards/commission; there are decision-making bodies and advisory-only bodies. Those that have decision making authority are the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), the Architectural Review Board (ARB), and PZC.

Vice Mayor De Rosa suggested adding language to indicate that liaisons will be appointed at the Council organizational meeting.

Mr. Keeler stated that Council could have a liaison for ARB. Ms. Kramb stated that ARB is very busy lately and she thinks they could use a liaison. Ms. Alutto agreed. Mayor Fox agreed and asked if BZA has ever asked for one.

Mr. Reiner asked if there are decisions coming out of these boards that are not of the best interest of the City. He is not a big fan of liaisons. PZC members are more schooled on

planning than Council members. PZC has felt that they were making the tough decisions and became frustrating to find out Council would overturn those decisions. We want to appoint people to execute the common good of the City. This discussion tells him that Council does not feel that way. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that this is really about communication. People are getting busier. They may not have the chance to watch Council meetings. As the community grows, there are people who have not lived here for as long and this provides the opportunity to help them to continue to understand what has been important in the past or in the future. This is not a reflection of the quality of an appointee. Mayor Fox stated that it is a balance. We want open communication so board/commission members understand what their resources are. Vice Mayor De Rosa stated the liaison is to meet with Chair and Vice Chair. They do not onboard new members. That belongs to staff. Mayor Fox suggested asking ARB if they want/need a liaison. Mr. Reiner stated that he stills think it is a question of clarity. Appointees should be planners or architects that should have a good understanding of the job. Ms. Alutto stated liaison is there to share things that Council believes generally and if we received a lot of applications from architects and planners, we would populate the boards with those professionals. Council needs to decide some of the larger issues/concerns like homeowners' associations. Ms. Alutto stated that will be discussed at Wednesday's (August 31, 2022) joint meeting.

Mayor Amorose Groomes moved to direct staff to update Council Rules of Order Section 12.03 per meeting discussion and to bring to Council for consideration. Ms. Alutto seconded.

Vote on the Motion: Mayor Fox, yes; Mr. Keller, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that staff will bring the consideration of additional liaisons back with the resolution amending the rules.

Most Connected/FTTH Follow-Up

Mr. McCollough shared an in progress update on Council's Most Connected goal and Fiber to the Home.

The City held Innovation Day and staff considers it a great success. There were attendees from inside and outside the state. Great information was delivered and it allowed the City to articulate its goals. The City of Dublin described what it means to be most connected city in the world. We did not want anyone coming to table later saying that they didn't know what we were doing, why, or how to get involved and that event took care of that concern.

The City released its Request for Proposals (RFP). We believed it reached all entities that needed to see it. Key players and participants were highly aware and able to respond. Innovation Day helped them to distribute the RFP. Staff has received a few questions and

responded publicly as is the normal process. There were not any great surprises in the questions. Staff was able to answer and publicize back onto the website. The RFP was closed per the schedule. The team is very happy with the volume, content and diversity of the responses received. Enough responses were received to understand what the market can do. We encouraged people to partner up and work together so all responses were relevant. We tried to be careful not to prescribe to the market and we have gotten a potpourri of different responses. A hard direction has not chosen. We received different business models and are in a position to choose the direction we want to go. There are carriers, local companies, national providers, new companies and established ones. Staff is leaning heavily on the City's third-party contractor, Entropy. They have been tasked with performing an analysis of respondents and they have come back with preliminary thoughts. Their review is still in process and should include options and risks. Their analysis will not include a final recommendation. That will be done internally. Mr. McCollough recognized the internal team (Michael Farrar, Dana McDaniel, Greg Dunn, Lindsay Weisenauer, and Doug McCollough). The internal team will do a separate analysis and combine the two to provide a recommendation to Council. That step will likely be a request for a recommendation to move forward with negotiations. There will not be a final cost number until negotiations are complete. The intent is to negotiate final scope and terms with that provider, and at that point, the City would expect to move from the initial phase into the execution phase. The City believes they have viable plans from responses received

Mr. McDaniel shared with Council that Dublin has signed up to be the host for the 2022 Intelligent Community Forum's Global Summit held October 26-27. There, we will be celebrating top 10 connected cities from around the world and all of them will likely have a contingency here. They will spend the day here followed by dinner at the statehouse, and tours the following day. Attendees will be staying in Dublin. There will be discussions about the Intelligent State of Ohio as well.

Mr. Reiner thanked Mr. McCollough and stated that he is looking forward to the report.

Mayor Fox asked if there were any surprising responses. Mr. McCollough stated that there were some new technology. We felt that Passive Optical Networking was likely the technology that we would be working with. There were different ways of getting signal to homes that were intriguing. We did find some different ways of thinking on the technical side. On the business side there were models that were vastly different from each other.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked how many responses were received. Mr. McCollough responded that there were 7. The approaches were able to be broken down into similar groupings. Staff began to see 3 patterns emerging. Different models where municipalities are looking at how to get this service to the community.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that Council has received an update that other communities are stepping up to the plate with regard to fiber to the home. It would seem that momentum would be helpful. She asked for Mr. McCollough's thoughts on that. Mr. McCollough stated that we always try to keep Dublin 2 years ahead. Because of the amount of work we've

already done, we have a deeper understanding of this than other communities. There have been some communities stumbling forward into American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funded plans that may not be as well thought out as Dublin. If we take great care, we can have more permanent future-proof solution that is imbedded with the rest of our connectivity. We are talking about a "Most Connected Community" whereas others are just talking about fiber to the home. Mr. McCollough thanked and acknowledged everyone working on this.

Historic Preservation Discussion

Ms. Rauch stated that there have been multiple opportunities to discuss historic preservation and they are there this evening to continue the conversation. She introduced Greg Dale with McBride Dale Clarion, and stated that he is here to help facilitate the discussion and pinpoint Council's direction. We will be looking at the local district as well as the National Register District and how those districts work in conjunction with one another.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that Ms. Kramb had sent a list of topics of consideration to staff and Council. Ms. Rauch stated that the memo staff provided was based on those items.

Mr. Dale stated that he read the minutes from Council's April meeting and reviewed Ms. Kramb's memo. It seemed to him that there are a lot of different ideas being discussed. He believes it would be helpful to narrow down the discussion and think about and separate the following two things: the local zoning district and the National Historic Register district. Items for consideration with the local district include the boundaries, the zoning standards, Historic District Guidelines, and the administrative review process. The period of significance is of interest as well. Some of the same considerations are pertinent to the National Historic Register district. He reiterated that the National Register district is not a local designation. He explained that he is not here to recommend anything but to facilitate discussion.

Mr. Keeler stated that the high-level question is whether there are certain properties that are more sacred than others and if there is a certain time period when a property was built that we want to retain. There has been an erosion of the historic district. Dublin does not have the luxury of having a large stock of properties that are worthy of blanket preservation.

Mr. Reiner stated that Council has had an intensive discussion is what should be preserved but never came to a decision on what is worth saving. Also for consideration is how to rebuild a house that fits architecturally in the space. The boundaries are fairly well established currently.

Mayor Fox stated that, for her, the question is, "Why do we want to preserve something?" In response to Mayor Fox's question regarding the National Historic Register properties, Ms. Kramb stated that National Register has nothing to do with local zoning regulations. It is purely related to federal dollars and action. Mayor Fox does not believe there has been enough education around this.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she would decide what to preserve by identifying what buildings are important to the City's history. Other cities tell the story of their city by

historically significant buildings. If one of those treasures needs rebuilt, she would want us to rebuild around those historical treasures to tell the same story.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that where the boundaries are fine. She is a big advocate for identifying individual properties that they want to save. Some buildings are significant because of what took place in them or the materials they were built with. It is appropriate to identify what is significant. With regard to infill, new structures should look like they fit unless there is good reason for juxtaposition. Although she may not agree with size and scale of new construction in the district, she does like the materials. Most important is that any new build is an enduring piece. Price should not drive what the historic district looks like. We want this to be a pedestrian portion of the City.

Ms. Alutto stated that there is some confusion about Council's philosophy and direction in terms of meaning, materials, infill, placemaking, etc. It is important to put the thoughts and philosophy in writing in a way that is digestible. It is important to articulate all of this.

Ms. Kramb stated that following issues: new construction, demolitions, identifying what we want to preserve, and the philosophy. Between current guidelines and zoning code, Dublin is at a good point where we have figured out materials, form and philosophy with regard to new construction. We have to let that play out. What that leaves is demolition and what we want to keep. Dublin decided in 1986 what we were going to keep. Properties currently listed on the National Historic Register (district and individual properties) are 95% of what we want to preserve. In 2017, we sent a consultant out and looked under current standards and they looked at everything older than 50 years. The consultant provided a document identifying significant properties (contributing and non-contributing). Council accepted that document and accepted the recommendation. That is what has muddled up this discussion. Council has to decide if we want the consultants' recommendation or to pick certain properties.

Mr. Dale summarized the discussion so far. Boundaries are not being debated. Zoning and design standards are only 18 months old and they need to play out. The review process itself is not under consideration. He is hearing demolition and philosophy as topics. They spent a lot of time wordsmithing demolition. Contributing versus non-contributing classification mainly relates to demolition standards. The standard is higher for contributing buildings than non-contributing. The basic standard is no economic use for the property.

Ms. Kramb stated that it is working under the standards. The question is what constitutes contributing versus non-contributing. She suggested removing contributing vs. non-contributing and going with properties listed on the National Historic Register list is the simplest answer. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if someone can apply to be removed from the National Historic Register. Ms. Kramb responded that it is difficult and Ohio has only ever removed one thing and it was completely demolished. Mr. Dale asked if everything in the National District is also in the local district. Ms. Kramb answered affirmatively.

Ms. Rauch referenced the map including in Council's packet. Everything in orange is an individually listed National Register property and everything outlined in red is part of the National Register district.

Mayor Fox asked if a property is now in the district because of the 50-year sliding scale. Ms. Kramb explained that once a property has gone through the application and designation process, it is listed and that list does not change.

Ms. Rauch stated that if that is the direction to go, the City could further designate specific properties. Ms. Kramb stated that if we get rid of that contributing/non-contributing language, that would remove the high burden for demolition for all properties except those on the Historic Register.

Ms. Amorose Groomes would like to identify all properties to be preserved by address. Ms. Kramb stated there has to be a fair standard and not just an address. They can be listed by address but there has to be a reason.

Mr. Dale asked if staff has the guidance to work on this. Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively. Mr. Dale stated that there are a lot of big ideas for discussion. There is the idea of doing an area plan for this district. Those are exactly the kind of questions that will be answered through a planning process.

Vice Mayor De Rosa if we agree to protect something, when it hits the threshold and can be demolished, we should have some rules about what can be rebuilt. That would be another discussion. Mr. Dale stated that there was a lot of time spent with the public discussing this topic. The community was split down the middle so the Code language is "similar". New build standards can be revisited and discussed if needed but all of that is in the code and guidelines. Some of this is public education. Mayor Fox stated that the people that came were over the broader district. If you narrow it down to the area that we are really trying to preserve, she thinks the answers would be different. They would really want to preserve the historic district. If we could have higher standards for areas in the central part of the district, having a plan might have some leniency on other areas but put parameters in place to preserve the character. Mr. Dale stated that this covers four difference zoning districts. The current historic district is more than just the district.

Ms. Kramb stated if we were to change the language from contributing/non-contributing to listed on the district or not listed, that opens up the residential properties then and they no longer have that huge burden of contributing.

Mayor Fox stated that one of the fears she has heard is that they are looking for ways to lift some of the heavy burden but they do not want to lift it all. There is a balance to be maintained. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that is what planning and zoning's job is every day. The feeling there is not that much different throughout the rest of the community.

Mr. Keeler stated that we should be specific with regard to rebuilds/new builds in the area. Mr. Dale stated that those protections are in there now. If a building meets the standard for demolition, when something new is built, it needs to be similar. Mr. Keeler stated that 3 High is an example of something that is similar but "Disney-fied" and we don't want that. Mr. Dale stated that there will always be some level of discretion at the Architectural Review Board

(ARB) level. This will never be finished. There is always room to look at these standards and improve.

Mayor Fox stated that she would love to hear what each Council Member would want preserved.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she would be interested to see what buildings looked like in their prior lives. Are there historical records/documentation assist ARB to see what "similar" would look like. It is important to keep the history of the building.

Ms. Krumb stated the process of documenting the history of the property exists and the federal government requires it for demolition.

Mr. Keeler stated that the local historical society was able to provide documents for his house. The house went through multiple changes over time. The interpretation could be different based on the time period he chose. Building materials would be a no-brainer way to ensure authenticity.

Mr. Dale confirmed that there no interest in expanding historic district boundaries.

Ms. Rauch stated that staff can go back and compile more information on the listed and contributing properties for Council to look at.

Mayor Fox stated that the time period from 1880-1920 is worth preserving to her. Hearing from Council what they feel is worth preserving and precious is important for ARB.

There being no further discussion, the work session was adjourned at 7:59 p.m.



Presiding Officer - Mayor



Deputy Clerk of Council